

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/088,409	Applicant(s) OLSON ET AL.	
	Examiner James S. Bergin	Art Unit 3641	

All Participants:

(1) James S. Bergin.

(2) Gregory S. Rosenblatt.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 11 May 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112 2nd paragraph rejections of claims 39 and 47, now resolved by amendment 2/11/2004

Claims discussed:

Claims 34-53

Prior art documents discussed:

Not discussed


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner imposed a new restriction requirement in this application, requiring the applicants' representative to elect between the following two distinct inventive groups. Group I, claims 43-53 drawn to the combination invention of ammunition with a discharging apparatus including the special technical feature of the casing, after firing, acting as the projectile by being driven forward into the barrel and discharged therefrom by the firing of a subsequent similar ammunition, and Group II, claims 39-42 drawn to the subcombination invention comprising ammunition having a case formed of cast zinc or a cast zinc based alloy and not including the special technical feature of the casing, after firing, acting as the projectile by being driven forward into the barrel and discharged therefrom by the firing of a subsequent similar ammunition. In response to this requirement, Mr. Rosenblatt elected invention group 1, claims 34-38 and 43-53 without traverse and authorized the examiner to cancel the non-elected claims 39-42 via examiner's amendment.